Remarks

Claim 1 has been rejected as being anticipated by Baranda et al, WO 99/43589 (identified by the Examiner as "Henley"). Claims 2-4 have been rejected as being unpatentable and obvious over Baranda et al in view of Schaefer et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,975,480 and Spuhl, U.S. Patent No. 3,631,960. Claim 5 has been rejected as obvious and unpatentable over Baranda et al in view of Viita-Aho, WO 00/15535. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The present invention relates to an elevator lift drive assembly in which cage and counterweight guide rails are arranged at a support column, the guide rails extending through the lift shaft to the base of the shaft pit, the lift drive being supported on both the guide rails and the support column.

The Examiner cites the Baranda et al reference as teaching the claimed construction. This is incorrect. Baranda et al teaches a lift assembly in which solely the support column supports the lift drive.

While Baranda et al teaches that guide rails extend vertically along the support columns, it states that they extend "at least over a length of the support columns corresponding to the path of elevator car travel." Page 5, lines 7-8. The recitation of such a variable length is indicative of the fact that the rails are not intended to extend to the base of the shaft pit and provide any other function rather than guiding the car and counterweight. Indeed, such a construction is consistent with conventional construction, known to those in the art, in which guide rails are fixed to supporting elements by fastening elements allowing relative motion between the guide rails and

the support columns in the longitudinal direction of the guide rails. The fact that Baranda et al does not intend for the guide rails to extend to the base of the shaft for support of the lift drive may be found by Baranda's statement that the guide members may be either formed integrally with the support columns or may be separate from and disposed about a perimeter of the support columns. See, page 4, line 35 through page 5, line 3. If the guide members were intended to serve a drive support function, there would have been specific reference to the need for them to be so positioned to bear a portion of the load.

As Baranda et al does not teach a guide rail construction extending through the base of the shaft pit to bear a portion of the load of the lift drive, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 5 are not anticipated or rendered obvious (in claim 5) by the reference and accordingly that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 have been rejected on the combination of Baranda et al, Schaefer et al and Spuhl, the Examiner contending that Schaefer et al and Spuhl both teach the use of mounting bolts for securing motors and drives to their base, and that adjustment means to facilitate alignment of motors and drives are well known in the art. In addition to Baranda's failure to teach the basic rail construction disclosed, as discussed above, neither Schaefer et al nor Spuhl either provides the lack of teaching or reasonably teaches the further construction element recited in claim 2, in that the lift drive is supported by way of a setting screw bearing against the guide rail.

Schaefer et al shows a motor mount in which the motor 12 is rigidly mounted to motor carriage 18, which in turn is slidably adjustable along base 14 and is bolted thereto. An adjustment mechanism 14 includes a bolt 50 with nuts positioned thereon to allow longitudinal

adjustment of the carriage 18 along the bolt. The bolt does not support the motor against a guide rail or bear the weight of the motor. Indeed, it does not bear the weight of an element; support of the mass of the motor is performed solely by the bases.

Similarly, Spuhl discloses a spring straightening device, wherein the straightening device is to bring conveyed helical springs into a defined position. This is achieved by means of a pneumatic cylinder 131/132 which acts on a slider which in turn is in contact with a defined part of the spring. Such adjustment means is not in the manner of a setting screw as recited in claim 2, nor is it device supporting a weight load bearing against a guide rail or any other element. The adjustment means in Spuhl does not include any component whatsoever for bearing a weight load.

Neither Spuhl nor Schaefer et al teaches or even suggests the use of a setting screw to support a lift drive by bearing against a guide rail. Indeed, neither reference teaches even an analogous construction wherein an adjustment means is intended to bear a weight load. It is only with the hindsight resulting from consideration of the present invention that any association whatsoever could be made between the teachings of the references and the present invention. The use of hindsight is improper, and the assertion that the use of bolts in conjunction with motor mounts, as exemplified by Schaefer et al and Spuhl, is simply too vague and generalized to provide the necessary teaching of the setting screw load accommodation structure as recited and claimed herein. Accordingly, claims 2-4 are not rendered obvious by the art of record and are allowable.

Withdrawal of all rejections and passage to allowance of all claims is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEITZER CORNMAN GROSS & BONDELL LLP
Attorneys For Applicant
292 Madison Avenue - 19th Floor
New York, NY 10017
Telephone (646) 424-0770

JAB/cw BY _____
JAY A. BONDELL, ESQ., Reg. #28,188

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on June 20, 2006.

Carol L. Wood _____